





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS





10
THE COMPLETION

OF THE

POLITY OF THE REFORMATION

THE

WORK OF THE 19TH CENTURY.

BY THE

REV. EDWARD PHILLIPS, M.A.,

INCUMBENT OF ST. MARK'S, SURBITON.

SECOND EDITION, WITH PREFACE.

LONDON:

BELL AND DALDY, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1870.

P R E F A C E.

I HAVE been induced to republish, with a few omissions and necessary alterations, a pamphlet which has been out of print for some years, in the hope that some good may be done in helping, with others, to direct the thoughts of Churchmen into right channels in these critical times.

It is now seven years since I ventured to indicate a course which seemed to be one of safety for the Church, beset with many present dangers, and with many more impending over her. For many years the Church had been throwing off the torpor of past generations, and was emerging into vigorous life. It did seem of no little importance that this renewed life should be brought under suitable constraint and guidance, in order that it might assume conditions of health, and that the seeds of disease, unquestionably existing, might not develop into chronic disorder, with the certainty of a fatal issue. Those seeds of disease have not remained dormant during a period of exceptional stir and excitement.

The last seven years have produced changes both in Church and State, changes actually wrought, and changes in public opinion, with the prospect of early results, so startling that the mind can scarcely realize them in their sudden evolution.

Who would have predicted seven years ago that household suffrage would now be a principle of the Constitution?—that one branch of the United Church of England and Ireland would now be disestablished? And who would venture to circumscribe the changes of the next seven years? Already organic changes in the Universities and House of Lords are foreshadowed; and whilst the disestablishment of the Church of England herself is an absolutely settled point amongst sectarian bodies, it is sullenly recognised as all but settled by a large proportion of the members of the Church, and by one not uninfluential section looked to as a desirable consummation. In real truth, whatever might have been the prevailing feeling a few years ago as to the security of the Established Church, none can shut their eyes to its present insecurity; indeed, the possibility of maintaining the Esta-

blishment is one of the current questions of the day, and few would deny that to maintain it in its present disorganised state is simply an impossibility. The call, therefore, to the members of the Church at large to set their house in order is now the call of imperative necessity, if the only alternative is to be avoided—an alternative which few unprejudiced Englishmen can contemplate with serenity. And what is that alternative? It is nothing less than denationalizing the only national Church that was enabled at the Reformation to throw off the corruptions of the middle ages without losing her identity or damaging her integrity; it is the repudiation, on the part of the nation, of the Church of St. Augustine, to which the nation owes its Christianity and its civilization, and which for twelve centuries has been intimately mixed up with the nation's history—to which the nation owes not only the circulation of the light of the Gospel through a land enveloped in all but heathen darkness, but the revival of that light when it was wellnigh quenched by the mass of error and superstition maintained by Papal authority, under which the Church and nation groaned; and if it be a subject of rejoicing that the Papal yoke has been broken, it should be borne in mind that this deliverance was attained with the aid of the civil power, and to divorce the Church from the civil power is to undo the work already accomplished at so much cost—to further the designs of the Papacy, which is putting forth its utmost strength to regain the ascendancy in this country.

It is impossible to shut one's eyes to what is going on elsewhere; that, whilst the representative of the might and majesty of England is content with the modest title of "Defender of the Faith"—a title consistent with God's promise to His Church, that "kings should be her nursing fathers, and queens her nursing mothers;" consistent with the responsibility with which God has invested the Sovereign of England, who rules over a larger dominion than that which constituted the Empire of Rome in her palmyest days, when she assumed the sovereignty of the world—the modern occupant of the throne of Rome, who at least equals his heathen predecessors in arrogance, is demanding the allegiance of all mankind, as Sovereign *Dictator* of the faith to all nations, and therefore to free England; whilst history, both past and present, represents him as the disturber of the peace of all nations, and no nation has more reason than England to testify to the truth of this latter representation, whilst protesting against the arrogant claim, now reiterated in the face of the world with an outward pomp of circumstance unparalleled.

Is it at such a time as this that Englishmen can talk of disestablishment? Is the voice of prophecy forgotten, which arose from the fires of martyrdom with which the Reformation was inaugurated? A candle has been lighted in England that, by God's mercy, shall never be put out. And shall England now throw aside the candle-

stick upon which that light was lifted up—to which the Reformation martyrs testified? Disestablishment of the Church of England, in the face of the pretensions now put forth by the Church of Rome! May God arrest the thought of such infatuation! Disestablishment, indeed!

The Church of Rome knows full well what is the meaning of disestablishment under the present circumstances of the Church, if we were ignorant; that it means disintegration, each section constituting a separate sect, and disintegration of the one religious body which is an effectual obstacle to the temporary success of Romanism—the one body that can meet the Church of Rome on her own ground, that of tradition, ready to prove that she is more in accord with the primitive Church than is the Church of Rome, ready to prove that she is not only more Scriptural, but more Catholic. But we must acknowledge with shame that we have fallen short of our privileges, that in the past self-security and worldly prosperity were too productive of carelessness and indolence, and now, in a day of sifting, we exhibit a sad spectacle of anarchy and division within the Church, whilst we can scarcely deny that we are as a body more responsible for the many secessions around us than the seceders themselves. We utterly, however, deny the inference which is triumphantly thrown in our faces, that the Reformation was a mistake, and has proved a failure. It was not a mistake, nor has it proved a failure, in so far as the purpose of the Reformation was carried out. It secured to the Church sound doctrine and sound principles of government, and the Church has adhered to this sound doctrine to this day. The mistake has been the not carrying into practical effect those principles of government which were intended to be embodied in fixed laws, and the failure therefore has been in the due maintenance of the necessary order and discipline for carrying on the Church's work effectively. What then ought we to do? Neither to show impatience nor despondency, but, like sensible people, seek, *whilst there is time*, to rectify our mistake and look for success to take the place of failure. As we owe the Reformation, as far as it went, to the joint action of the Church and the State, so may we look to the same joint co-operation to give the country the benefit of a completed Reformation. It was the object of the following pages to urge this course, as the course of wisdom and the course of safety; and, however imperfectly I have fulfilled my purpose, I would fain hope that there are some points touched upon that are worthy the consideration of those who will bring greater knowledge and greater wisdom to their settlement. If no other good be effected, some good must be done by calling public attention to the valuable matter of the Reports of the "Cathedral and Collegiate Church" Commission of 1852. What is at once wanted is the revival of that Commission. Most of the members of the Commission are still alive, and would resume their work with a vastly enlarged experience, attained during the last

eventful decade, and supported by an irresistible force of public opinion in dealing with proved abuses, and in recommending what is deemed intrinsically best for the country, irrespective of private interests, with whatever high names or powerful classes associated. There is one essential condition for securing due weight to the decisions of the Commission, that it should contain a fair representation of the laity and parochial clergy.

E. P.

ST. MARK'S VICARAGE, SURBITON,
Dec. 8th, 1869.

THE COMPLETION

OF THE

POLITY OF THE REFORMATION.

WE live in an age of reform. With the growth of popular intelligence and power, there has been a gradual growth of popular influence upon the administration of public affairs, and a gradual adaptation of the institutions of the country to its requirements.

Making allowance for occasional failures in legislation, through mistakes, or the perversity of political partisanship, we have cause to be thankful for the real improvement of the civil polity under which it is our privilege to live, for the removal of numberless abuses and corruptions in various departments of the State, for the softening of the penal code and the general purgation of the laws, for the pure administration of justice, and for the high standard of official integrity.

The progress of Ecclesiastical Reform has been more slow, and less successful. Still some progress has been made; and of late years sounder principles have been recognised, than those which characterised the earlier changes of the present century. It is painful to look back upon some of those changes. In the year 1835 a Royal Commission was appointed for the purpose of inquiry into the state of the Church generally, and for the suggestion of measures for the improvement of the Church's efficiency. This was followed up by several Commissions in quick succession. Much valuable information was elicited by these Commissions. Amongst other facts, returns were published of Episcopal and Capitular Revenues, and also of the annual value of all livings throughout England and Wales. But the practical results of this ecclesiastical investigation were anything but satisfactory.

The current of public opinion had been running very strongly against the Establishment; the Cathedral bodies being held in low esteem, from a prejudice that those bodies were maintained simply for the enjoyment of wealth and idleness; whilst the Bishops were the especial mark of popular indignation, the part taken by the Spiritual Peers in the question of Parliamentary Reform having, doubtless, stimulated the people's illwill. The Bishop of Bristol had been mobbed in the streets, and the Episcopal Palace of Bristol burnt by the populace; and so little secure was felt to be the position of the

Episcopal body, so little of public sympathy was felt to be with them, that the Prime Minister of the day could venture to warn the venerable Prelates, from his place in Parliament, to set their house in order.

I will not dwell upon the ecclesiastical legislation of this period. It took place in the midst of panic, and bears the marks of fear rather than of unfettered deliberation. I suspect that few of the eminent men who now adorn the Episcopal Bench would uphold the principle, or make themselves responsible for the results, of that legislation. The main object appears to have been to pacify popular feeling by making the large Capitular and Episcopal revenues available for carrying into effect a very popular notion, the improvement of a large number of poor incumbencies already existing, and to furnish a moderate endowment to the many new churches springing up in populous districts without any endowment at all.

In carrying out this notion, good in itself, of improving the condition of the ill-paid portion of what is commonly styled the working clergy, the equally if not more important question was overlooked, how the working clergy could be made to work harmoniously, to the furtherance of the public good, instead of, by their independent and often contradictory action, stimulating division and strife, and so working for evil rather than for good.

The Capitular revenues were the first to be dealt with, and they were dealt with most unsparingly. Official incomes were reduced, and canonries suppressed; but, whilst the Cathedral Establishments were impoverished, and their working staff diminished, not a single practical abuse was removed; so that they were left just as much objects of public hostility as before. Reform, as regarded the Cathedral Establishments, resolved itself into confiscation. The Episcopal funds were subjected to a no less revolutionary invasion. There was an entire redistribution of these funds, and, as in the case of the Cathedral Establishments, without adding in the least to the efficiency of the Episcopate. There was this distinction in dealing with the Episcopal body, that, if little account was taken of its spiritual influences, great account was taken of its temporal interests. The following is a return made to the Commission of 1835, of the net incomes of the Archbishops and Bishops on three years' average, ending December, 1831:—

Canterbury	£19,182	Ely	£11,105
York	12,629	Exeter	2,713
London	13,929	Gloucester	2,282
Durham	19,066	Hereford	2,516
Winchester	11,151	Lichfield and Coventry	3,923
St. Asaph	6,301	Lincoln	4,542
Bangor	4,464	Llandaff	924
Bath and Wells	5,946	Norwich	5,395
Bristol	2,351	Oxford	2,648
Carlisle	2,213	Peterborough	3,103
Chester	3,261	Rochester	1,459
Chichester	4,229	Salisbury	3,939
St. David's	1,897	Worcester	6,569

This gives a total of 157,737*l.* as the amount of the Episcopal revenues of that period. These revenues have since increased. The

total net revenues upon an average of seven years, ending December 31, 1843, was more than 164,000*l*.* The course pursued with reference to this fund was to reduce the incomes of the richer sees, and to raise those of the poorer, *i. e.* about one-half, up to what was deemed the peerage standard; so that, after allotting distinguishing incomes to certain sees, 15,000*l*. a year to Canterbury, 10,000*l*. to York and London, 8000*l*. to Durham, and 7000*l*. to Winchester, the remainder of the sees were endowed with an average of something less than 5000*l*. a year. Much scandal was created by the enormous sums expended upon Episcopal palaces, and not a little by the fixing as a rule the Bishop's residence at a distance from his Cathedral.

With reference to the first ground of complaint, I make the following statement from a letter of the late Sir B. Hall (afterwards Lord Llanover):—

“Within a very few years 60,000*l*. has been expended on the palace of Lambeth, and 143,014*l*. on the Episcopal residences and demesnes of eight dioceses; whilst in these eight dioceses only 5259*l*. could be found for the benefit of the *working clergy*, by the augmentation of small livings. In these eight sees there are 85 livings under 50*l*., and 417 livings between 50*l*. and 100*l*. a year.”

With reference to the second ground of complaint, I quote from an admirable letter from the late Bishop of Exeter to a more recent Commission:—

“I am not aware of any mode of rendering more effective the union of the Diocesan with his Cathedral, excepting the obvious one of providing Episcopal houses near the Cathedral, where there are none; and making fit for residence those that are not fit. But I may be permitted to express my satisfaction at seeing the attention of Her Majesty's present Commission given to this important object; the more so, because the Ecclesiastical Commissioners seem to have regarded this matter as of no moment. In the instance of Gloucester and Bristol, two sees having each an Episcopal house close to the Cathedral, the residence of the Bishop has been fixed at a considerable distance even from the Cathedral which is nearest to it; and this at a cost which it is painful to remember.

“At Lincoln, where there are most venerable remains of the ancient Episcopal palace, and a site and grounds most salubriously and beautifully situated close to the Cathedral, a vast expenditure was incurred in providing a residence for the Bishop at the distance of two or three miles from the Cathedral.

“In neither of the two new sees of Ripon and Manchester has a house been provided near to the Cathedral.

“At Rochester, the old Episcopal residence, being several miles distant from the Cathedral, has been exchanged for one much more remote. But this is accounted for by the limits of the diocese having been so extended, as in effect to cut it off entirely from the Cathedral city, which is at the extreme verge of the existing diocese.

“At Worcester, an old and excellent palace, close to the Cathedral, has been assigned to the Dean, and the residence of the Bishop permanently fixed at his country mansion. This arrangement may, perhaps, be deemed to need revision, when a change of incumbents shall make it unobjectionable.

“At Durham a similar measure has been adopted, the Episcopal palace there having been given to the uses of the University. In reference to this see I would venture to suggest the expediency of hereafter, when vacancies shall permit, removing the residence of the Bishop from Auckland Castle, ten miles distant from Durham, to the *Deanery*, which would give to the Bishop one of the best ecclesiastical houses

* This does not include Sodor and Man, the return for which see was 2555*l*.

in England. The Dean might receive in exchange one of the houses at present assigned to the Canons, several of which would be of sufficient size and character for such an appropriation."

There had been a call on the part of many earnest-minded members of the Church for an increase in the number of Bishops, to meet the vast increase of the population. This demand was met by the creation of two new sees, Ripon and Manchester; but to effect this Bristol was merged in Gloucester, and, incredible as it seems, it was settled to suppress Sodor and Man altogether. Sodor and Man was an anomaly according to the idea of Episcopal Commissioners at that time; it wanted the assumed requisite of an English Bishopric, a peerage; and so this see, dear to true Churchmen, as having been held by the model Bishop of the English Church, Bishop Wilson, must be suppressed. This outrage, however, was prevented, mainly through the determined resistance in the House of Lords of the noble Lord Powis. Practically there was but one Bishop added to the Episcopate; and to secure the finality of this settlement, all moneys derivable hereafter from Episcopal revenues, beyond what was required to meet the conditions of the settlement referred to, were to be transferred to the common fund for the improvement of small livings. It would really almost seem that the great object of this reforming effort was, after pacifying the people by the sacrifice of a large portion of the Cathedral endowments, without the removal of a single abuse of administration, to improve the temporal position of the Episcopal body, as a whole, and to make the spiritual office as subordinate as possible. The Bishop was a great State functionary, and member of the House of Lords. This dignity must be sustained at any rate; 4500*l.* a-year, with a country mansion, were the essentials. His relation to the Cathedral chapter, or to the clergy of the diocese, was of small comparative consideration.

I now gladly turn from the early and hasty acts of modern Church Reformers to the wiser and more consistent deliberations of a more recent date, although these deliberations have not yet resulted in legislative enactments. There may be one good result from the recklessness of the changes which have taken place,—the wholesale confiscation of corporate funds, and their transference to objects quite different from those for which they were originally intended, the suppression of dignitaries, the infinite alterations in the disposition of public and official patronage; there may, I say, be one good result of the startling policy alluded to, that its boldness, at least, can be no ground of prejudice against any future line of policy which may be deemed expedient for the interests of the Church.

Since 1835 the Church has gone through a fearful crisis. At a period of religious deadness and apathy, Whitfield and Wesley came forth from the University of Oxford as the champions of evangelical truth, and with a zeal which no opposition could check stirred up the hearts of their fellow-countrymen to an appreciation of the simple preaching of the Gospel; so when, at a more recent period, open disaffection to the Church was extensively manifested, there were not wanting in both our Universities fervid spirits to meet

the special necessities of the times. In 1833 a small band of University men (with the exception of the Christian Advocate of Cambridge, H. J. Rose, belonging to Oxford), united together for the defence of the Church's teaching and discipline. The reaction in the country was, perhaps, unparalleled; but, as in the case of the earlier movement just referred to, so in the case of what is called "the Oxford movement," those who held rule in the Church were not equal to the emergency, were not able to guide and utilise the zeal that was called into action. In the one case, the movement resulted in the great Wesleyan schism, and other sectarian divisions; and in the other case, there was a considerable defection to the Church of Rome—a defection distinguished more by the position and high personal qualities of those who left the Church than by their numbers.* Both these movements, though entailing upon the Church the loss of much piety and zeal, which could be ill-spared, yet left their permanent impression for good. The last movement has led many to investigate the principles of the Church, and consequently has led to the spread of the knowledge and appreciation of those principles. It has led, moreover, to practical Church work—to the multiplication of churches to an extent unknown since the Reformation, and to a great improvement in their character and arrangement; to the spread of Church education; and, what is still more important, it has led to efforts for the improvement of the Church's organization; to a wonderful development of the Colonial Episcopate, with unrestricted synodal action; and in our own country to a revival of the deliberative powers of Convocation.

It is the improvement of her organization which is the Church's great want at the present time, both for the development of her own spiritual life, and for protection against her enemies; to Christianise the mass of practical heathenism nominally within her pale, and to resist the aggressive attacks of Romanist and Protestant sectarianism. The population has outgrown the machinery of the Church; but, what is of more serious consequence, that machinery is out of gear, and whilst that is the case, it is of little use to add to its power and complexity. More churches and more clergy are wanted; but what is especially wanted is, more rule and order—more supervision—therefore, a more adequate controlling power to combine and direct the subordinate agencies of the Church. In the present disorganised state of the Church, the multiplication of churches and clergy may lead to great disappointment as to the result. The first thing is, to put the existing machinery of the Church into working order, and then the extension of the machinery may be expected to tell beneficially.

* Contemporaneous with the Oxford movement was that attack upon the English Church on the part of the Pope of Rome, which went by the name of the "Papal Aggression," the Pope having divided this country into various sees, over which bishops were placed with local titles, Cardinal Wiseman being the legate, with the title of Archbishop of Westminster. For a time the country was thrown into a state of great excitement. The No-Popery cry was raised; party spirit was stirred up both within and without the Church, and even experienced statesmen were driven from their propriety. This excitement, combined with the puerilities displayed, not by the leaders, but by some of the followers in the Oxford movement, brought upon this movement much undeserved obloquy, and blinded the eyes of the public to the importance of the principles it sought to set forth and illustrate.

There are about 20,000 clergy, as a body the best-educated in the country, with a higher standard of morals than any body of the same numbers in this or any other country, and, moreover, as a body possessing considerable wealth, quite independently of their professional incomes. Now, does the influence of the clergy at all correspond to the conditions referred to? Certainly not. And why not? Simply because it is comparatively without discipline. There is little unity of purpose or action. Instead of acting with the combined force of an army, there is all the weakness of an irregular body, recognising no authority, each following his own individual caprice; and it ought not to be lost sight of, that this disorganization has a tendency to increase from the increase of unendowed incumbencies, where the clergy are dependent in a great degree upon their personal popularity—their professional income being entirely derived from pew-rents. Congregationalism is, in fact, rapidly superseding all Church authority; instead of the Bishop being a centre of unity for a diocese, each Minister being the centre of unity to the congregation whom he is able to attract to his church or chapel. If this tendency is to develope, it is easy to perceive that the Church will become actually weaker by extension. What is really wanted in the Church is government. This want has been, more or less, experienced ever since the Reformation; but in these last times has been more strongly manifested, as complete liberty of conscience has become a recognised principle. The fact is, that the Reformation was never completed. Catholic truth had been cleared from the additions and corruptions by which it had been overlaid through the power of the Papacy; the reformation of doctrine had been accomplished, but the arrangements for keeping the truth alive—for maintaining the order and discipline of the Church—were arrested in their progress. The *Reformatio Legum*, though drawn up for the settlement of the Church's polity, was never carried into effect.

It was the design of Cranmer greatly to enlarge the Episcopate, and to perfect the Cathedral establishments, over which the Bishops were placed; making them, amongst other things, schools for training up the clergy, both in theological knowledge and in the practical work of the pastor's office, immediately under the eye of the Bishop, the chief pastor. Provision was made both for Diocesan and Provincial Synods, by which the rulers of the Church were to be kept acquainted with the state of those portions under their respective jurisdictions, and assisted in strengthening what was right and remedying what was wrong. This design, however, was frustrated by Cranmer's death, and has never been resumed. The Church has gone on, exhibiting various phases of prosperity, but never realising her theory of Divine government, until it seemed that the very idea of discipline was dying out. Circumstances have, however, stirred up the minds of many to a sense of shame at the unreality of the Church's position as the National Church, as well as to a sense of fear for her stability as the National Church; for in this restless age she cannot expect to retain that position unless she can adapt herself to the wants of the nation, and get a hold upon the affections of the nation. The desire has been

growing, and spreading upwards amongst those in authority, to render the Church efficient for her proper work, and, in any measures of reform, to follow the lines of the *Great Reformation*, to carry on and complete the purpose of Cranmer, as regards the external polity of the Church, so far as it is suited to the times, the mainspring of that polity being *an adequate working Episcopate*.

It is with great satisfaction that I call attention to a Royal Commission issued in 1852. The following are the objects specified:—“To inquire into the state and condition of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, and into the duties of the members and ministers thereof, and other matters connected therewith, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as (regard being had to the purposes for which such cathedral and collegiate churches were originally founded) may render the same more efficient and useful in promoting and extending the means of public worship and religious education, and in enforcing ecclesiastical discipline in the several dioceses in which they are situate; and also (where occasion may seem to require) with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may make the said cathedral and collegiate churches, and the revenues thereof, available in aid of the erection of new sees, or of other arrangements for the discharge of Episcopal duties.”

Nothing can be more satisfactory than the selection of the Commissioners, and nothing can be more full, and fair, and candid than the manner in which the inquiry entrusted to the Commissioners was carried out.*

Three Reports were the result of this Commission, the final one printed in 1855. These Reports contain a large amount of very valuable and interesting information, and many valuable suggestions; and it would be a great advantage to the Church if the contents could be more generally known. Besides a survey of the history of the Cathedral corporations, and of Episcopacy in connexion with these corporations, and various communications, both from Cathedral Chapters and from Bishops, these Reports contain a large body of statistics having reference to the subject-matter of inquiry. I will only advert to a few points, with a view to a practical suggestion which I would venture to make.

In the first place, we learn from these Reports that the Cathedral is the *parish church* of the diocese, and the Bishop is the *chief pastor* of the diocese, and, by inference, ought to be identified with the Cathedral, where is his throne, and where, surrounded by his council, the Chapter, he ought to reside, maintaining in the mother-church the highest type of worship, and from this centre diffusing spiritual life and vigour to the subordinate churches of the diocese, keeping alive the regular worship of God, in the first place, and as the chief pastor (the *pastor pas-*

* The following is a list of the Commissioners, in addition to the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London:—Marquis of Blandford (now Duke of Marlborough), Earl of Harrowby, Bishop of Oxford (now Bishop of Winchester), Sir John Dodson, Sir W. Page Wood (now Lord Chancellor), Dr. Wordsworth (now Bishop of Lincoln), Dr. Hook (now Dean of Chichester), the Rev. J. Jackson, M.A. (now Bishop of London), and Rev. W. Selwyn, B.D.

torum) exercising personal watchfulness over those who are employed in the pastoral office under him. Of course, such a personal supervision of a diocese implies that a diocese ought to be of manageable proportions; and that is just what our modern dioceses are not. It is almost needless to show how utterly impossible it is for the present Bishops, with their overwhelming dioceses, and secular duties imposed upon them as Peers, in addition to their spiritual duties, to realise the episcopal office. As to personal intercourse with the vast multitudes for whose souls they are responsible, their personal intercourse with their clergy is next to nothing; and yet, if there be any hope of healing the miserable divisions in the Church, and bringing the discordant elements of a professing Churchmanship into something like harmony, that hope rests in the establishment of the Divine rule of government—the MORAL influence of a spiritual aristocracy, the *élite* of the clergy, who, by their intellectual and moral qualities, have proved their superiority over their brethren before being made their superiors in position, as Fathers in God, the sphere of their rule being only such as is commensurate with the reasonable possibility of accurate personal supervision. There is a letter printed in the Appendix to the First Report, from Dr. Kaye, the late Bishop of Lincoln (in his day the Nestor of the University of Cambridge, to whose wisdom and prudence all looked up), urging upon the Commissioners the subdivision of dioceses. The following passage occurs in this letter:—"I am of opinion that the erection of new sees and the subdivision of dioceses is a measure urgently needed. The diocese from which I write (Lincoln) is a striking illustration of this need. Reduced though it has been from its former limits, it contains 822 parishes, or ecclesiastical districts (612 in Lincolnshire, 210 in Notts), in an area of 3448 square miles. This is a district which it is impossible to superintend, with due attention to the circumstances, wants, and condition of each parish, and its pastor; and a Bishop who should wish to preach in every church in the diocese, and should devote one Sunday to each parish, would require more than fifteen years to make the circuit. The result of this disproportionate size of a diocese to the powers of any one man is, that there cannot be confidential and intimate communication between the Bishop and his clergy; that many of the most deserving clergy are unappreciated and unknown; that confirmations are less frequent than they ought to be; and that the Bishop, instead of being looked upon by the laity as their chief pastor, is known only as a state officer—rarely seen by any, by many never—who has to perform certain functions at distant intervals."

From the First Report we learn, that in the time of William the Conqueror the population of this country was about 1,250,000, and that the number of sees in England and Wales at that time amounted to 21. In Henry the Eighth's reign the population had increased to about 4,000,000, and it was intended to erect 20 additional sees, and to increase the number of Bishops still further, by the addition of about 26 Suffragans; so that, at the time of the Reformation, about 70 Bishops were not deemed too many for a population of 4,000,000.

Only 6 sees were actually erected, making the number of Bishops 27 — 1 less than our present number, when our population exceeds 20,000,000. The actual number, according to the Census of 1861, is 20,061,725. To bring up the number of Bishops to the actual standard of the Reformation, which was then not deemed sufficiently high, the number ought to be 135. The population of London alone is now more than half the population of England and Wales in the time of Henry VIII.; and the spiritual and moral supervision of this population, which will be increased by another half-million at the next avoidance of Winchester, is left to the responsibility of one man, who has, in addition to this enormous spiritual charge, to perform, during six months in the year, laborious parliamentary duties. If Episcopacy is to be anything more than a name, such a state of things ought not to be allowed to remain.

In no other Christian country is there such a disproportion between the population and number of spiritual overseers. In France, according to the Reports before me, there is a Bishop to 400,000 souls; in Bavaria, a Bishop to 300,000; in Austria, a Bishop to 358,000; in Spain, a Bishop to 203,000 souls; in Portugal, a Bishop to 113,000; in Sardinia, a Bishop to 110,000; in the Two Sicilies, a Bishop to 106,000 souls. Sweden, with about 3,000,000, has 13 sees. Free Greece, with less than 1,000,000 people, has 24 sees. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America has about 1800 clergy, and 32 Episcopal sees; indicating that, as in a Protestant Church there is more freedom of opinion than in either the Greek or Roman Churches, so there is need of more moral control to prevent the development of allowable differences of opinion into party division. Whilst in England, in 1835, there were 11,728 benefices, and about 18,000 clergy, there were, and are still, only 28 Episcopal sees—a less number than the American Church has for only 1800 clergy! At the present time there is one Bishop to 752,202 souls, with the average charge of more than 700 clergy!

Why should this strange anomaly be allowed to remain? Why should the Church of England be an exception to all other Churches? Why should the Church of the richest country in the world, to her grievous detriment, to the subversion of all order, to the destruction almost of her corporate character, be allowed to have a fewer proportionate number of spiritual rulers than is maintained in the poorest countries? Strange as this anomaly may be, the reason for it is stranger—that our spiritual rulers have double responsibilities, and double cares, and double duties. Our spiritual rulers are also (unfortunately for the Church, in some respects) temporal rulers, and have to bear the cares of the State as well as of the Church. Our Bishops are Peers of Parliament.

Without a doubt, the great difficulty in the way of adapting the Episcopate to the exigencies of the Church arises from the identification of the Episcopal office with the Peerage, and the high standard to which recent legislation has raised Episcopal incomes. This difficulty evidently hampers the Commissioners. The necessity for an increase

of the number of Bishops is admitted: where the necessary funds are to come from is not so apparent. They say very little upon that part of their inquiry, how far the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and the revenues thereof, may be made available for the erection of new sees. A large proportion of these revenues had been appropriated (it might be said, misappropriated) to the improvement of small livings, not in connexion with the several Cathedrals, but in all parts of England and Wales. The Commissioners cannot urge any further deductions. They recommend that in some cases the office of Bishop and Dean be combined. Coadjutor Bishops are also recommended under certain circumstances, as when Bishops are incapacitated from age or infirmity. The plan of Suffragan Bishops, adopted at the time of the Reformation, and subsequently laid aside, does not find much favour. There is a decided objection, and with reason, to Bishops of different ranks. In point of fact, these Suffragans would be Suffragans to Suffragans. The main recommendation of the Commissioners is, that a Permissive Act should be passed, empowering the Sovereign to subdivide dioceses, and erect new sees, *when sufficient funds can be obtained, both for the endowment of the new sees, and the provision of suitable Episcopal residences*—public subscriptions being depended upon for assistance in carrying out this arrangement. There has just been a recommendation to the same effect from a Committee of the Lower House of Convocation.

I should be sorry to cast any imputation upon the Commission of 1852. The Church and the country are under great obligation to the members of this Commission for the conscientious fulfilment of their duty. Besides the mass of important facts collected by them, there is the valuable body of suggestions which I have printed in an Appendix; and if their recommendation, with reference to the increase of the Episcopate, though bearing upon the vital principle upon which the efficacy of the whole Church system depends, seems to fall short of the occasion, every allowance is to be made for the position of the great proportion of the Commissioners, who, although not sympathising with the previous legislation, the result of the Commission of 1835, could scarcely adopt a course directly condemnatory of that legislation. But we poor clergy, who want the sympathy and guidance of our superiors in intellect and moral power to help and encourage us in our difficult vocation, and who do not so much appreciate that unapproachable superiority of rank which, clothed in purple and fine linen, dazzles without enlightening or warning us, are not bound by the same delicacy of feeling. We cannot help expressing our sorrow at the arrangements of the Episcopate, sanctioned by recent legislation, and our hope that these arrangements will be speedily amended.

Looking at the amount of the Episcopal and Capitular Revenues, as applicable to the rule and administration of the Church, and considering how large a proportion these revenues bear to the total revenues of the Church, is it fair to call for contributions from the people for this purpose (the rule and administration of the Church), important as it may be, without an effort to make the existing revenues

go as far as they may be reasonably expected to go, with all due consideration for the dignity, as well as for the practical efficiency, of the ruling body?

The total revenues of 26 cathedral and 2 collegiate churches, in 1852, was 313,005*l.* 2*s.* 0*d.*, and, deducting the sum of 42,827*l.* 8*s.* 1½*d.*, paid over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the available revenue was 270,177*l.* 13*s.* 10½*d.* Add to this 164,000*l.*, as a low estimate of Episcopal revenues (net), and we get a total of 434,177*l.* 13*s.* 10½*d.*—nearly half a million for the maintenance of the Bishops and their Cathedral establishments. I do not say, for a moment, that this is too large an expenditure for the efficient government of the Church. On the contrary, I do not think that the Church will gain so much by deducting 43,000*l.* from the Cathedrals, as by more consistently employing this money in developing the proper uses of Cathedrals; but I do say—and I believe that the best friends of the Church will agree with me—that with such revenues the spiritual government of the Church ought to be more efficient than it is. It is a mockery to say that these revenues will not adequately and consistently sustain more than twenty-seven Bishops, and that, if the Church requires more, she must supply more funds, and that, until more funds are forthcoming, even the commonest episcopal function must be largely neglected, and when performed, commonly so performed as to do more harm than good to the general population. In the principle of Confirmation, or the admission to full communion by the chief pastor of candidates duly prepared by the parochial clergy, is involved the Christian education of the people, and yet few comparatively partake of this rite; and when, at “distant intervals,” the “state officer” does appear at some central town, to “perform that function,” to which town candidates are brought in crowds from the surrounding parishes, the result is too often more scandalous than edifying. The Church is both able and willing to find funds for better pastoral superintendence, and would second, I have no doubt, in a large and sacrificing spirit, any honest legislative effort for this end; but, seeing that the new standard of a Bishop’s income represents a capital sum of about 150,000*l.*, independently of an Episcopal palace, the Church can hardly be expected to subscribe an immense sum of money, just to make a very small addition to the number of “state officers,” some addition to the patronage of the Prime Minister, and but little or no addition to the security for carrying on the Church’s work in a healthy and efficient manner. The Church does not want a few more spiritual Barons, but many spiritual Fathers, to give weight and efficacy to Episcopacy in the country; and it will probably be found that a large and bold measure of Church Reform, which will give life and efficacy to the Church system, without materially altering the existing relations between Church and State, will be safer than a small temporising change, which will satisfy no party, will just stimulate the desire for further change, and stave off for a time only an entire revolution of our ecclesiastical polity.

Assuming that it is highly expedient to maintain the connexion of

the highest order of the priesthood with the House of Lords, and thus to give a religious character to the civil government, and to give to the civil government a certain power of control over the Church—which is, doubtless, of the utmost consequence to the well-being of the nation, the predominance of priestly power being one of the greatest evils under which a nation can suffer—it is expedient to avoid the risk of the final expulsion of the whole Episcopal body from the Upper House of the Legislature, by making the adequate increase of the Episcopate practicable without such an alternative; but to maintain Episcopal incomes at what is now deemed the necessary Peerage standard, is to make such adequate increase of the Episcopate an impossibility, and, therefore, to make the other alternative more than probable—the disconnexion of the Episcopate from the Peerage altogether.

There would be, doubtless, a great difficulty in creating a new class of Suffragans, and so making new distinctions in the same order; but there is a recognised distinction between Metropolitans and Suffragans proper—a distinction which formerly was decidedly marked. Why not indicate this distinction more strongly, and so get out of a practical difficulty? *Multiply the number of Metropolitans with permanent seats in the House of Lords, and let all the Suffragans be out of the House, with ample incomes to maintain their rank as high ecclesiastics, but not such exorbitant incomes as are now deemed to be necessary to support the rank of Peers.*

Already the Legislature has made a distinction amongst Bishops, upon no definite principle, by giving permanent seats in the House of Lords to the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, whilst other Bishops come into the House by rotation. The above-named Bishops might at once be made Archbishops, and to them might be added Oxford and Ely, as connected with the great Universities; Exeter, for the western part of England; Lincoln, for the eastern part; Lichfield (formerly metropolitan), for the Midland Counties; and St. David's, for Wales.

Here would be eleven Archbishops for England and Wales, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as Primate, who might be advanced to the dignity of Patriarch. These would make up eleven Archiepiscopal Peers to represent the Church of England in the British Legislature, affording ample security for all the objects for which spiritual peerages are desirable, whilst scope would be given for the development of a working Episcopate, according to the requirements of the Church, without any further derangement of a recognised principle. Every town of more than 100,000 inhabitants might thus hope to have its own Bishop, to give unity and vigour to Christian efforts (now desultory and feeble) to meet the moral evils which naturally develop themselves at the great centres of industry.

Such a change as this, though important in its practical results, has nothing especially startling about it. It simply amounts to this: that nine Bishops would be at once advanced to a higher dignity—to the rank of Archbishops. There would be no novelty in this increase in

the number of Metropolitans. In the First Report there is given a catalogue of Episcopal Sees, from Bishop Godwin, amounting to 52, and in this number 7 were Metropolitan Sees.* Then, as each of the 16 Suffragan Sees became vacant, it would be subdivided; 2500*l.*, or, in some cases, even 3000*l.* being allowed as income to the next incumbent, without the imposition of parliamentary duties, whilst the remainder of the existing income would suffice for the endowment of another see.

Surely this change is nothing like so revolutionary as other changes which have already taken place. To relieve the future incumbents of 16 sees from secular duties—which are a great hindrance to the present holders of those sees in the discharge of their spiritual functions—can hardly be deemed so strong a measure as the suppression of 10 sees altogether, which took place in Ireland many years before disestablishment was thought of.

Then, as to the reduction of income, there will be little to complain of; for, besides that the diocese will be proportionately reduced, in real fact this high standard of income is a *recent innovation*. If, from the return given at p. 6, the 15 lowest net incomes be taken, it will be found that the average does not amount to 3000*l.*; and these were the incomes of Spiritual Peers. By this arrangement there would be eventually an addition of 16 Bishops, considering that at present there is one Bishop out of the House whose see might be divided. In every metropolitan cathedral a Suffragan Bishop might consistently take the place of Dean. Thus, 11 more Bishops would be provided from the

* Godwin de Præsulibus Angliæ, ad Calcem Dedicat., ed. Richardson, Cantab. 1743.

Provinciæ Cantuariensis Episcopatum Index.

	Page		Page
Asaphensis	631	Lincolniensis	281
Bangorensis	617	Londinensis, Archiep. olim ..	169
Bathonensis	363	Menevensis	571
Bristolensis	563	Norwicensis	427
Cantuariensis, Archiep.	37	Oxonienſis	543
Cestrenſis	312	Petroburgensis	557
Cicestrenſis	499	Ramsburiensis	335
Cornubiensis	396	Roffensis	519
Coventrenſis	312	Sarisburiensis	329
Creditonensis	395	Seolſeiensis	499
Dorceſtrenſis	280	Sherbornensis	330
Dorobernensis, Archiep.	37	Sidnaceſtrenſis	280
Dunwicenſis	424	Sunningenſis	333
Elſienſis	247	St. David's, Archiep. olim ..	571
Elmhamenſis	425	St. Germani	395
Elviensis	632	St. Petroci	395
Exoniensis	395	Tawtonensis	395
Glaſtonienſis	370	Thetfordenſis	426
Gloceſtrenſis	551	Wellenſis	363
Herefordenſis	447	Westmonaſterienſis	570
Landavenſis, Archiep. olim ..	595	Wigornienſis	447
Legeceſtrenſis	280	Wiltonienſis	335
Lichfeldenſis, Archiep. olim ..	307	Wintonienſis	201

Provinciæ Eboracensis.

	Page		Page
Carleolenſis	761	Eboracensis, Archiep.	647
Cestrenſis	775	Hagustaldenſis	719
Dunelmensis	725	Lindisfarnenſis	718

existing funds of the Church; indeed, for a recommendation of the Commissioners, that *in certain cases* the office of Déan and Bishop might be combined, might be substituted the rule that *in all cases* there should be a *resident Bishop* at the head of the cathedral establishment, the name of Dean being abolished altogether.* This would simply be a return to the primitive practice, as is stated in a letter from the Bishop of Exeter, already referred to, addressed to this Commission. In answer to an objection to this arrangement, that it would impose the duties of another functionary upon the Bishop, it may be replied, that the functions of the Dean might be very consistently discharged by the Archdeacon, who might be a residentiary, with a competent income, just as the Dean was formerly charged, not only with the superintendence of the Cathedral, but with archidiaconal duties in the city parishes.

Thus the present revenues of Bishops and Deans might be made to support 11 Archbishops, the minimum income being 5000*l.*, and the maximum 15,000*l.*; and 62 Suffragans, including Westminster and Windsor, with incomes varying from 1500*l.* to 3000*l.* a-year: constituting the most highly-paid Episcopate in Christendom beyond all comparison.

“The highest dignity of the Church in France” (I quote from Sir B. Hall’s letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, before referred to), “the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, has, I believe, only 2000*l.* a-year and a residence; the French Suffragan Bishops have incomes varying from 500*l.* to 1000*l.* a-year each. The highest ecclesiastical dignity in Prussia, the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne, has only 2000*l.* a-year and a residence.”

If some such arrangement as this were made, the Church might be saved from a frequently recurring scandal. Bishops not being necessarily Peers, there would be less ground for resistance on the part of the Government to the restoration of the constitutional rights of the clergy and people in the election and confirmation of Bishops,—the

* A pamphlet has just fallen into my hands written by the Rev. E. Stuart, Incumbent of St. Mary Magdalen’s Church, Munster Square, Regent’s Park, in which this last suggestion of doing away with Deans is advocated. There is much to be said in favour of Mr. Stuart’s proposal, not only to put Bishops in their proper place, now usurped by Deans, to give to Bishops the control over their own cathedrals, instead of permission to occupy an ornamental throne, whilst the Dean holds the real one, but to substitute a diocesan chapter for the cathedral chapter, giving the Bishop four resident chaplains, instead of four practically non-resident canons. I do not agree with his desire for the exclusion of the whole Episcopate from the House of Lords, nor with his proposition as regards the dispensation of Episcopal patronage. There is no doubt that, if the country is to possess an adequate Episcopate, the bulk of the Bishops must be out of the House of Lords; but I cannot but feel that both Church and State will derive great advantage from having a body of the order of the Episcopate in close connexion with the civil government. This body would exercise a most wholesome conservative influence in keeping the larger body of subordinate Bishops in harmony. Again, as the very *élite* of the Episcopal body, they would add to the deliberative power of the House of Lords, without exciting any jealousy of their limited voting power. And they would be the safest depository of the bulk of the Episcopal patronage, not only as, from their elevated position, taking a calmer survey of the state of parties than those engaged in the strife necessarily going on amongst the parties themselves, but, whilst having the weight of great individual responsibility laid upon them, having the tendency to the abuse of responsibility checked by a public opinion led by those (the Suffragans) who would be interested in the dispensation of patronage in their dioceses, as Bishops, and not as patrons.

appointment to the Metropolitan Sees being made from the body of Suffragans direct, solely upon the authority of the Crown.

Then, both State and Church would be better represented by a selection from a body of Bishops whose capacities and judgment had been tested by experience, than by men caught up haphazard from the cloister of a college, a public school, or a parish, and transferred, without any preparation, to the House of Peers.

The number of Metropolitans might be greater or less than I have suggested. I have simply indicated a principle for an indefinite increase of the Episcopate, without a breach of ecclesiastical order, or a rude severance of the tie between the Episcopate and the Civil Government.

In considering any comprehensive plan for the increase of the Episcopate and rearrangement of dioceses, the important question as to the distribution of patronage cannot be overlooked. This, doubtless, is a difficult question; but the main difficulty is occasioned by the false assumption as to the nature of patronage, arising from its long-continued abuse.

The abuse of Church patronage is, perhaps, one of the greatest blots upon the Church of England, and the public mind has been so habituated to this abuse as to have almost lost the sense of its true nature. Instead of a trust, it is commonly looked upon as a property, or a perquisite of office. It was to this blot that Mr. Bright, with such force of truth, pointed the finger of scorn; and it will be a great mistake, because Mr. Bright, and such as he, show no very friendly spirit to the Church when pointing out her defects, for those who are interested in the Church's welfare to shut their eyes to these defects.

Looking to Episcopal patronage, the right administration of this patronage is of the first importance, because it must have a beneficial influence upon the administration of other patronage, whilst the abuse of patronage upon the part of the spiritual heads of the Church is a warrant to other patrons to be careless. Now, since the celibacy of the clergy is no longer enforced, the temptation to married Bishops to provide for their families out of the Church revenues at their disposal is very great, and experience shows it to be almost irresistible. Nepotism is simply nature's law, and it will be useless to attempt to put it down by any law of man. The only thing is to reduce it within as narrow limits as possible.

Doubtless it is a strong objection to the increase of the Episcopate, that by multiplying Bishops, and subdividing Episcopal patronage, you increase nepotism. The object, therefore, is to multiply Bishops without needlessly subdividing patronage. Now, if to the Metropolitans the bulk of the Episcopal patronage of the province be given, here would be an advantageous limitation to the abuse of Episcopal patronage.

The patronage of the Suffragans might be limited to the offices of their own Cathedrals and the livings of the Cathedral city, as far as possible, without interfering with private patronage. Then, again, the Capitular patronage might be put into the hands of the presiding

Bishop, subject to the consent of the Chapter. Thus, in the event of a piece of Cathedral preferment being vacant, let the Bishop nominate, each member of the Chapter expressing his assent or dissent by ballot.

In the disposal of Crown livings, might not the three Ecclesiastical Privy Councillors be constituted the advisers of the Crown? This surely would be more in the spirit of the Constitution than leaving this responsibility in the hands of lay functionaries, without check or control. The Lord Chancellor holds his enormous patronage by virtue of a fiction, that he is the keeper of the Sovereign's conscience,—a fiction that was once a reality, when the Lord Chancellor was a high ecclesiastic.

Perhaps the interests of the laity might be protected by a modified application of the right of veto.

Any such redistribution of public patronage does not involve the slightest interference with vested rights. There can be no such thing as vested rights in public patronage. Public patrons are simply trustees for the public, and the public have a perfect right to vary the trust in any way which may tend to further the object of the trust. What a large amount of civil patronage has been given up under the new arrangements for competitive examinations!

Now, although the organization of an Episcopal Church is plainly dependent upon the efficiency of the Episcopate, yet it must be confessed that any large scheme for making the Episcopal revenues available for a more extensive and popular Episcopate does not at present commend itself to our rulers in Church or State. The plea for resistance to an increase of the Episcopate, that the country does not want more Bishops, is unfortunate. If it be true, it only comes to this, that the country understands very little about the true nature of the Episcopal office from the modern exhibition of that office, and does not want more Bishops, because those we have are not appreciated. I fear that it would be quite as popular a measure to confiscate the Episcopal revenues and to divide them amongst the *working clergy*, as was the misappropriation on the part of the Bishops of a large portion of the Cathedral revenues; and is there no fear that this example may some day be followed in a way not contemplated at the time? Is there no fear that, if the Episcopate cannot be made more practically useful to the Church in the estimation of the nation at large, it will not be allowed to remain so expensively ornamental? It cannot be concealed that there is little popular sympathy with the Bishops of the Church of England, and it will be wiser to seek to popularise Episcopacy than to make the unpopularity of Episcopacy an argument against all change of its condition.

A provision being made for an adequate Episcopate, that first essential of discipline, the other intentions of Cranmer might be readily carried out. Theological Colleges, as recommended in the last Report of the Commission, might be established in connexion with some of the Cathedrals—say with each of the Metropolitan Cathedrals—for the preparation of candidates for holy orders; in which also there should be a regular training for the Diaconate, for persons who are now em-

ployed in populous places as Scripture Readers and City Missionaries. Now that the Universities are to be thrown open to the public at large, and the existing Colleges are to lose their Church-of-England exclusiveness, training schools for the Clergy are more imperatively called for. I should be sorry to see the Clergy educated as a separate caste; but, whilst obtaining a liberal education at the great seats of general learning, it is only fitting that they should have some professional training before entering upon the important and difficult work of their holy profession. As Students at Law are transferred from the Universities to Inns of Court, so might Divinity Students be transferred to the Cathedral Theological Colleges. Diocesan Synods, as Cranmer proposed, might take place at regular intervals, in which the laity might take part, for the purpose of furthering practical Church-work. To these might be added annual Provincial Synods. For the Convocations of Canterbury and York might be substituted one National Convocation, under the presidency of the Primate, to meet annually, as at present, or triennially, with the existing power to make canons, *as sanctioned by the Crown*.

It is not my purpose to go into further detail, having already gone to a greater length than I intended. Without pretending to be wiser than others, I have my own thoughts, and I use an Englishman's privilege of expressing them, under the conviction that the time has come when the clergy and laity ought to speak out plainly: for the time has come when the work of Cranmer must be carried on, or we must be prepared to see his work undone.

Cranmer was too wise a man not to see the necessity of organization for securing the Church's soundness and efficiency, and too prudent not to provide for this organization, in consistency with the Church's Episcopal Constitution; but we, as a nation, whilst glorying in our great Reformation, have been content to accept what Cranmer accomplished in his life, and utterly to ignore what his death only prevented him from accomplishing; and with a result confirmatory of Cranmer's wisdom, and our folly.

Our Reformed Church is only national in name; it does not include a large portion of the nation, and what it includes is only half Christian.

The principles of Cranmer's ecclesiastical polity, to give efficiency and, therefore, strength to the Church, were so reasonable, that they had the sanction of the most imperious of the Tudor monarchs; and can it be that the civil government of a Constitutional Sovereign, who is really a loving mother to her people, should oppose these principles, which are absolutely essential, under any circumstances, to the Church's well-being, and, under existing circumstances, it might almost be said, essential to her actual being, *i.e.* as the National Church? for it ought not to be forgotten that, until recent times, the Church was upheld in her weakness by State protection, and all other religious bodies were prevented from putting forth their strength, by legislative restrictions: but now the cases are reversed, and all other religious bodies are perfectly free to act; whilst the Church, when she

would rouse herself to meet the necessities of the times, is hampered at every turn—is made to feel that the privilege of State protection is, in very deed, a yoke of bondage. Where Henry VIII. was large and liberal in his policy, giving the Church scope for development, our modern Government is narrow and restrictive; refusing a consistent spiritual Episcopate, to develop the Church's power, and imposing a limited body of State functionaries, just to keep down her power: but where Henry VIII. exercised a tyrannical will (almost under the pressure of necessity, having to resist the Pope's claims to supremacy in the appointment of Bishops), and made it compulsory upon every Chapter to elect the Bishop nominated by himself, under the severe penalties of a *præmunire*, there our modern Government walks in his steps, without the same necessity; and whilst removing every legislative enactment that trenches in the slightest degree upon the liberty of Romanists and Dissenters—under cover of a law that is a disgrace to a Christian State—causes at every election of a Bishop the perpetration of a profane mockery, which no Christian people would tolerate, were they cognisant of the truth:* and all this, not for the maintenance of any

* *Address from a Dean and Chapter to a Bishop Elect.*

“To the Rev. ———, your humble and devoted the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of ———, in the Diocese of ———, send greeting.

“We, the said Dean and Chapter, do humbly certify to you that the Episcopal See of ———, being vacant by the death of ———, we, the said Dean and Chapter, did on ———, the —th day of ——— instant, with all due reverence receive his Majesty's Patent of Congé d'Elire, or Royal License, under the Great Seal of Great Britain, for electing to us another Bishop and Pastor, and also his Majesty's Letter Recommendatory, under his Royal Signet, to us the said Dean and Chapter directed. And then and there, according to the tenor of the aforesaid License, we did agree to proceed to the election of a future Bishop of the Church aforesaid, as aforesaid vacant, and for that purpose did cause all and singular of the Canons and Prebendaries of the same Church, and others having, or pretending to have, any right or interest in that behalf, to be cited to appear on this — day of ———, to give their consent and voices respectively; which said — day of ——— being come, and *Prayers to Almighty GOD before all things being humbly offered up*, we the said Dean and Chapter, capitularly assembled in the said Cathedral Church, and making a full Chapter, did there, by virtue of his Majesty's Royal License, and according to the Statutes and *Ecclesiastical Laws* of the famous Kingdom of Great Britain, *canonically proceed* to the election aforesaid, in the manner and form following: (to wit)—

“First, *after mature and serious consideration had between ourselves concerning a FIT PERSON, in that behalf to be elected (saving to ourselves all the privileges that ought to be saved with regard to the said election, as well by the laws of this our famous Kingdom of Great Britain, as by the ancient and laudable customs of your said Cathedral Church)* we did at length agree to give our votes for you, being nominated and recommended to us by his Majesty's said Letter Recommendatory, as a person endowed with virtue, learning, wisdom, and other good gifts, and by virtue of his Majesty's said License and Letter Recommendatory, with our whole assent and consent, no one contradicting, we did elect you Bishop and Pastor of the said Cathedral Church: which said election of you as is aforesaid made, we immediately published to the clergy and people then and there present in the public and usual place, and all and singular other things of right or by custom in that behalf necessary, we have caused to be done and despatched in the presence of a Registrar or Public Notary, and other credible witnesses, as by Act or Public Instruments, which upon the whole election aforesaid we have taken care to make more plainly appear; all and singular which things, according to the Statutes of this United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in that behalf provided, were duly had and made, as we have signified to our said Sovereign Lord the King by other Letters certificatory of the day of the date of these presents, sealed with our Common Seal.

“The same like by these our Letters, sealed with our Common Seal, we do signify to you, and we earnestly desire you to give your assent and consent to such election so made of you as aforesaid.

“In testimony whereof,” &c.

constitutional principle, not for the maintenance of any real rights of the Crown, although it does involve the subversion of the rights of the people—the unbiassed election of a Bishop having been secured by more than one national charter. The Sovereign of England has as much to do with the appointment of a Bishop as the Emperor of China. It has become one of the Prime Minister's perquisites of office—a means of strengthening political ties, gratifying personal partialities, or recompensing personal obligations.

Now all this will some day come to an end. The whole mass of palpable abuses of the Church will be got rid of, as abuses of the State have been got rid of; untenable claims will be given up, as rotten boroughs have been given up, when the pressure from without is strong enough. The question is, whether it would not be better, under the present gentle pressure of the well-affected, honestly to meet at once the real wants of the Church, than to run the risk of giving up Church abuses and the Church, as a National Establishment, together? for, whilst the organization which is necessary to maintain the Church in her position of the National Church may be delayed till it is too late, the organization of Romanists and Dissenters cannot be prevented, is going on, and not without effect upon the country at large, and upon the Legislature.

Now, our true policy is to meet organization by counter-organization—not organization for party purposes, but for practical work; to strive to get rid of all proved abuses; to seek to strengthen all that is sound and good; to establish the Church in the hearts of the people; to make it national, as really influencing the nation; and then there will be no fear for our palladium of civil as well as religious liberty.

It would be a glorious work for the 19th century to complete the Reformation which was left unfinished at Cranmer's death; who had, I repeat, made preparations for an efficient Church government, to maintain the efficiency of the Church's teaching. Only let us have what Cranmer would have given us—manageable Dioceses, and competent Bishops to manage them; Diocesan and Provincial Synods of clergy and laity, for carrying on the practical work of the Church, making provision for the spiritual wants of the people, promoting their education, counteracting the evil influences in the way of their temporal as well as moral well-being, maintaining Missions at home and abroad; and Papal Aggressions and Anti-State-Church Societies would be very harmless affairs.

This would, indeed, be a glorious work for the 19th century, and would fill up the measure of the glory of the reign of Queen Victoria—a reign already signalized beyond all other reigns by the nation's progress in material prosperity, by the spread of education and the general improvement of the temporal condition of the labouring classes, by the enjoyment of the most complete personal freedom by all classes.

Oh, that a Cromwell and a Cranmer could be found to assist their Royal Mistress in securing for the nation sound religious training, to assist her in realising, to the extent of her heart's desire, her highest title—Defender of the Faith!

Leading Principles of a Complete Church Reform.

To make a large increase of the Episcopate, and to commence by applying to this object such funds as can be spared from the Episcopal and Capitular revenues.

To make a certain number of existing sees Metropolitan, with Peerages attached, the same incomes being retained as at present settled.

All other sees to be Suffragan, the Bishops being upon an equality of rank, but not Peers; incomes to vary from 1500*l.* to 3000*l.* a-year. Every Suffragan Bishop to reside near his cathedral, of which he is the presiding head.

The name of Dean to cease, except in the case of a metropolitan cathedral; a Bishop in all cases to take the place of Dean.

The Archdeacon to discharge the office of Dean, being a residentiary with a competent income, and, if possible, to hold the incumbency of the principal church in the cathedral city, with a Minor Canon as assistant, and as many Deacons as may be required in training for cures.

Every Cathedral to have attached to it, besides the Bishop and Archdeacon, four Residentiary Canons at least, four Minor Canons, and eight Honorary Canons; the Residentiary and Honorary Canons constituting the Chapter, or council to the Bishop, with an equal voice in all questions properly coming under the cognisance of the Chapter.

The Bishop, whilst chief pastor of the diocese, to have more especially parochial responsibility over the cathedral city. Every town, where the population exceeds 100,000, to claim a resident Bishop, if the necessary funds can be provided. The Residentiaries and Minor Canons to hold no other preferment, except within the bounds of the cathedral city and suburbs.

Honorary Canons to have an allowance for attendance, when required.

Theological Colleges to be attached to the metropolitan sees.

Coadjutor Bishops to be appointed where Bishops are incapacitated from age or infirmity.

The Crown to nominate Suffragan Bishops, but the election to be *bonâ fide*.

The appointment to metropolitan sees, from the body of Suffragans, to be a direct appointment by the Crown, and unquestioned.

That Diocesan Synods be held twice in the year, to consist of the Incumbent of each parish; and one delegated Layman from each parish; the Bishop to preside. One Provincial Synod to be held in each year, to consist of the Suffragan Bishops, Archdeacons, Rural Deans, and Proctors, elected at the Diocesan Synods; the Metropolitan to preside.

A National Convocation, to be held once in three years, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to consist of the Metropolitans and Suffragans, Archdeacons, Rural Deans, and Proctors.

That the Metropolitan should have the great proportion of the Episcopal patronage of the province; that each Bishop should have the appointment of the Archdeacon, Honorary Canons, Rural Deans,

and the patronage of all livings in the cathedral city and suburbs, not in the gift of private persons; that the Bishop should appoint to all livings belonging to the cathedral, with the consent of a majority of the Chapter, each member of the Chapter expressing his assent or dissent by ballot: the Chapter to attend service in the cathedral before proceeding to the ballot.

To consider in detail a complete measure of Church Reform, that a Royal Commission be appointed, similar in constitution to that of 1852.

APPENDIX.

Summary of Recommendations of the Cathedral and Collegiate Church Commission, 1852.

I. CONSTITUTION OF CATHEDRAL CHURCHES.

EVERY Dean and Canon Residentiary hereafter appointed shall reside at his Cathedral Church for nine months in every year.

That hereafter, in every Cathedral Church where the offices of Precentor, Chancellor,* Treasurer, or Subdean exist, the Dean and Canons Residentiary, with the assistance of the Minor Canons, be responsible for the fulfilment of the duties belonging to those offices, each person having his allotted share; and that hereafter no other persons be appointed to those offices.

That both the Prebendaries of the Old Foundation and the Honorary Canons of the New Foundation be styled Canons; that such Canons (not fewer than twelve) be appointed by the Bishop of every Cathedral; and that these, together with the Bishop, Dean, Canons Residentiary, and the Archdeacons of the Diocese, form the Greater Chapter of the Diocese.

That all the Canons Non-residentiary in every Cathedral have the right, now possessed by the Prebendaries of the Old Foundation, of voting at the election of a Bishop and of a Capitular Proctor to Convocation.

That the Canons Non-residentiary take their places in Choir and Chapter next to the Canons Residentiary and Archdeacons, according to seniority of appointment.

That any Non-residentiary Canon ceasing to reside in the Diocese (except under license), cease *ipso facto* to be a member of the Cathedral Church.

That the Bishop, wherever it may be practicable, have a place of residence in the Cathedral City, or in its immediate neighbourhood.

That besides the ordinary Chapters held under the presidency of the Deau, there be held once in every year, under the Presidency of the Bishop, a Chapter consisting of the Dean and Canons Residentiary; and also a Greater Chapter, consisting of the Dean, Canons Residentiary, Archdeacons, and Canons Non-residentiary.

That the Bishop have power to summon a Chapter of the Dean and Canons Residentiary, when he may deem it expedient, for the purpose of bringing under their consideration subjects relating to the Cathedral Church or the Diocese, and to preside therein.

That the Bishop also have power to summon the Greater Chapter, when he may deem it expedient, for the purpose of consulting them.

* It will be understood that this means the Chancellor of the Cathedral.

That, in the revision of Cathedral Statutes, care be taken to secure to the Dean the chief authority and government over the Cathedral body, any custom or usage of particular Chapters notwithstanding.

That in all cases in which, during the absence of the Dean, his authority devolves upon the Vice-Dean, the senior Canon in residence be invested with such authority, unless some other Canon shall have been appointed by the Dean, or by the Dean and Chapter (as the custom may be), to the office of Vice-Dean.

REVISION OF STATUTES.

1st. That a Cathedral Commission be appointed by Act of Parliament for a period of ten years, consisting of the two Archbishops, two Bishops of the province of Canterbury, and one of York, to be chosen by the Bishops of each province respectively, and four other persons, members of the Church of England (one of whom shall be Dean of a Cathedral Church), to be appointed by the Crown.

2nd. That, with the exception of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, each of the Capitular Bodies, into the state and condition of which we have been commanded to inquire, be empowered and required, with the concurrence of their Bishop, within one year from the passing of the Act for the Regulating of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, to prepare a draft of their Statutes, so as to render them suitable to existing circumstances.

And in case of a Capitular Body having no Statutes, that such Body be empowered and required to frame a Code of Statutes.

Such Statutes, in each case, to be made consistent with the constitution and duties of Capitular Bodies as regulated by recent legislation, such draft to be approved by their Visitor, and then laid before the Commissioners; and if it should appear to the Commissioners that any alterations of such draft are required, they shall return the same to the Chapter, with their remarks; and the Chapter shall return the draft approved by the Bishop to the Commissioners within three months.

That in default of such draft proposed by the Chapter, the Commissioners be empowered to prepare a draft of amended statutes, and send the same to the Chapter.

3rd. That when the statutes of any Capitular Body have been fully revised and approved by the Commissioners, they shall lay the same before her Majesty, and it shall be lawful for her Majesty in Council to issue an order or orders ratifying the same.

4th. That each of the Chapters, with the concurrence of their Bishop, shall also, within two years from the passing of such Act, prepare a draft of such alterations as to matters of detail and regulation as may be deemed necessary, but are not of such a nature as to require to be embodied in their Statutes, though in no respect substantially repugnant thereto; which draft shall then be laid before the Commissioners, and shall be dealt with in the same manner as is provided with regard to the draft of their Statutes; and that similar alterations may from time to time, during the continuance of the Cathedral Commission, be proposed by each of the Chapters to the Commissioners, and dealt with in the same manner.

5th. That after the expiration of such Commission, it shall still be lawful for any Chapter to propose any such alterations as to matters of detail and regulation as shall not be substantially repugnant to any of the Statutes, such alterations to be approved by the Bishop, and the Visitor of the Cathedral, and the Archbishop of the province, and finally laid before her Majesty in Council.

6th. That any Act appointing a Cathedral Commission, as recommended above, shall contain a clause repealing so much of the 47th section of the statute 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113, as directs the altered statutes and rules of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches to be submitted to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England, in order to avoid the inconvenience of two concurrent jurisdictions in relation to the same subject-matter.

That one of the two Canonries of Windsor which, on its becoming vacant, would be suspended, be withdrawn from the operation of the suspending Act, and, on its becoming vacant, be united with the Vicarage in the Royal Borough of Windsor.

That this Canonry be chargeable with the payment of two-fifths thereof, to the Vicar of the Holy Trinity, Windsor; and that the present Vicarage-house be transferred to the Vicarage of the Holy Trinity.

That the second Canonry on its becoming vacant be suspended, and that its endowment be divided among the thirteen Military Knights on the Upper or Royal Foundation.

PATRONAGE OF CANONRIES.

That on the appointment to any Canonry, a written statement of the qualifications or past services of the person appointed be signed by the Patron, to be presented to the Chapter, and preserved among their records.

That exchange of Patronage of Canonries be made (according to the Table annexed to this Report), on the principle that the Patronage of the Crown and of the Lord Chancellor should be more equably diffused, and that every Bishop should have the Patronage of some Canonries in his own Cathedral.

That in case of a Dean or a Canon Residentiary being desirous, by reason of old age or other infirmity, to retire from his Deanery or Canonry, he be allowed, with consent of the Bishop and Patron, or, if the Bishop be Patron, with consent of the Archbishop, to receive from his successor, as a retiring pension, such sum as may be approved by the Bishop and Patron, or by the Bishop and Archbishop, as the case may be.

That, if possible, the several Canonries of Norwich, Rochester, and Gloucester be severed from the Headships of Catherine Hall, Cambridge; Oriel and Pembroke Colleges, Oxford; to which they are now respectively attached; such annexation being incompatible with the amount of residence and duties which we have recommended for the Members of Chapters.

ARCHDEACONS.

1. That Canonries be severed from Archdeaconries, except in those cases where the Cathedral is situate within the limits of the Archdeaconry; and that (where it is possible) the Archdeaconries so severed from Canonries be endowed by attaching to them sufficiently endowed benefices.

2. That the Archdeacon of the district in which the Cathedral Church is situated, being a Canon Residentiary (whether the Canonry be annexed to his office or not) be allowed to reckon the time spent in diocesan duties as part of his residence.

3. That no Archdeacon, being a Canon Residentiary, be allowed to undertake any Cathedral office, which, in the judgment of the Bishop, is incompatible with the discharge of his duty as Archdeacon.

VICARS CHORAL OR MINOR CANONS.

1. That the number of the Minor Canons, in general, be not less than four.

2. That whenever it may be practicable, a house of residence be provided for the Minor Canons within the Cathedral precincts; and that, whenever it may be practicable, arrangements be made to give to the Minor Canons such opportunities of pastoral work as may qualify them for succession to a Benefice.

3. That the appointment of Minor Canons to Capitular Benefices be left to be regulated by the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113, s. 47, which provides that a scheme for the disposal of patronage be prepared by each Chapter.

4. That no person hereafter appointed to be a Vicar Choral or Minor Canon shall thereby become a member of any corporation of Vicars Choral or Minor Canons.

5. That the shares of the corporate income which would have been payable from time to time to newly-appointed Vicars Choral or Minor Canons, if they had become members of the corporation, and also the income of any vacant office of Vicar Choral or Minor Canon which is specially endowed, be paid over to the Dean and Chapter, and be treated as part of the Capitular Revenue.

6. That on the decease or resignation of the last surviving member of any such corporation, the corporation be *ipso facto* extinct and dissolved, and that all the

property of such extinct and dissolved corporation become vested in the Dean and Chapter, as part of the Capitular property.

7. That it shall be lawful for any such corporation, on the consent of all such members of the same as were elected previously to March 8, 1853, to surrender their charter or other title of incorporation, and thereupon such corporation shall be *ipso facto* extinct and dissolved, and all the property of the same shall become vested in the Dean and Chapter as part of the Capitular property.

8. That so much of the statute 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113, s. 45, as enacts, "that so soon as conveniently may be, and by the authority thereafter provided, regulations shall be made for fixing the number and emoluments of such Minor Canons in each Cathedral and Collegiate Church," be repealed, and that such regulations shall be made according to the enactments and provisions of that statute, by the several Deans and Chapters and the Cathedral Commission, which we have proposed, in order to avoid the inconvenience of two concurrent jurisdictions in relation to the same subject-matter.

PATRONAGE OF CAPITULAR BENEFICES.

That (saving existing rights) the Benefices in the patronage of Capitular bodies without their respective Dioceses be exchanged, under the provisions of the Act 16 & 17 Vict. c. 50, for Benefices within their own Dioceses.

That in any case where a Benefice in the patronage of a Chapter is not conferred upon a member of the Cathedral body, the right of presentation (saving existing rights) be vested in the Greater Chapter.

II. FUNCTIONS OF CATHEDRAL BODIES.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

That the services of the Cathedral Church, both on the Lord's Day and on other days, should be such as may most effectually minister to the honour of ALMIGHTY GOD, and promote the spiritual welfare of the Cathedral City and the Diocese.

That the Cathedral Choirs be maintained in full strength, and, if possible, increased in power, especially on the LORD'S DAY.

That it be made clear, by declaratory enactments, that the Bishop has the right of preaching, and of performing all the ordinances and ceremonies of the Church in the Cathedral, whenever he shall think proper.

That the Dean and Canons, when resident, shall attend once at least every day at Divine Service in the Choir, except when prevented by diocesan duties, or other reasonable causes, to be approved by the Dean and Chapter; such attendance to be enforced, according to ancient custom, by statutable fines.

That not fewer than two Canons, Residentiary or Non-residentiary, be present at each choral service of the Cathedral, unless prevented by sickness or other grave hindrance.

That the Dean or Canons take some part in the daily celebration of Divine Service.

That two sermons at least be preached on every LORD'S DAY, in the choir or nave of every Cathedral.

That with regard to Divine Service in the Cathedral, the Bishop have ordinary jurisdiction over the Capitular body.

OTHER DUTIES.

That all the time spent in preaching in Churches of the Diocese and other Diocesan duties be reckoned as residence.

That one Canonry at least in each Cathedral be not connected with any laborious pastoral duties.

That any Dean or Canon be allowed to hold a Parochial Benefice, the Church of which is not more than two miles from the Cathedral Church, and no other; and, secondly, that wherever circumstances may allow, the spiritual charge of

a District adjoining the Cathedral be vested in the Chapter, according to a scheme to be prepared by the Chapter, with the concurrence of the Bishop, and approved by the Cathedral Commissioners.

DUTIES OF CANONS NON-RESIDENTIARY.

That they shall attend the Annual Meeting of the Greater Chapter, and any special meeting summoned by the Bishop, except when prevented by reasonable causes.

That they preach from time to time in the Cathedral Church, according to a Cycle already established, or to be hereafter settled by the Dean and Chapter, with consent of the Bishop (saving any existing rights of appointment).

That every Canon performing the above duties shall receive, wherever provision can be made for the purpose, an annual payment from the Capitular Funds.

DUTIES OF MINOR CANONS.

1. That the Minor Canons take such parts of Divine Service on Sundays and weekdays as may be assigned to them by the Chapter.

2. That inasmuch as Minor Canons will in many cases succeed to Capitular Benefices, arrangements be made, where practicable, by the Dean and Chapter, for their assisting in the discharge of pastoral duties in the city and hamlets.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

That in all Cathedrals where the Grammar-School is a part of the original foundation, and sufficient funds can be provided, an endowment of not less than 150*l.* per annum be assigned to the Head-Master, with a commodious house, rent-free, for the reception of boarders; and where there is a second master, that an endowment of not less than 100*l.* per annum, with a house, rent-free, for the reception of boarders, be assigned to him.

That the boys on the foundation in the Grammar-School should be entitled to a liberal education free of expense.

That rewards be given to the most deserving scholars; and that, if possible, such Grammar-School should have one or more exhibitions annually to one of the Universities.

That there should be connected with every Cathedral a school in which the Choristers of the church should receive a sound religious, liberal, and useful education, in addition to their musical training; and that they should receive an apprentice-fee on quitting the Choir with the approbation of the Chapter, except in the case of their receiving an exhibition to the University.

That for admission to the Choristers' School preference be given to such boys as are likely to be afterwards fit to pursue their studies in the Grammar-School (where such exists), to which, if duly qualified, they should have right of admission, in case of vacancy, as foundation boys.

That the superintendence of each of the schools be committed to the special care of the Dean or one of the Canons Residentiary as guardian of the school, who should examine boys for admission, and also examine the scholars, either by himself or deputy, once at least in every half-year, and make periodical reports on its state to the Chapter and Bishop of the Diocese.

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES.

That it would be advantageous to religion and learning if, in each of the two Provinces, a certain number of theological seminaries were formed or restored.

DIOCESAN INSPECTION.

That, where it is practicable, one of the Canons be assistant to the Bishop in the work of Diocesan education.

III. LAY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS.

ORGANIST.

That in every Cathedral an adequate salary be provided for the organist, with a house rent-free within the precincts, where it may be practicable.

LAY VICARS OR CLERKS.

1. That suitable stipends, rising with length of service, be paid to the Lay Vicars or Clerks.

2. That (saving existing interests) the Corporation of Lay Vicars be dissolved, in the manner proposed with respect to the corporations of Minor Canons.

3. That, if possible, a fund be established for retiring pensions.

4. That it be a condition in the appointment of Lay Clerks that they be under the control of the Precentor, with respect to singing in other places than the Cathedral Church.

5. That the Lay Clerks be removable at six months' notice, or, in case of grave misconduct, immediately, with consent of the Bishop.

CHORISTERS.

That the choristers be placed under the spiritual care of one of the Canons. Also, that the Rule No. 4 (under the head of Lay Clerks) be applicable also to the Choristers.

BEDESMEN.

1. That the bedesmen discharge their statutable duties, and, where it is possible, their stipends be increased.

2. That they be removable for grave misconduct by the Dean and Chapter, with consent of the Crown, where the Crown has the appointment.

3. That they be placed under the spiritual charge of one of the Canons.

IV. FABRIC.

That a fund be set apart from the Capitular revenues of each Cathedral, which shall be sufficient for the repairs of the fabric of the Cathedral Church and the Capitular Buildings, the Chapter having power to borrow money for great emergencies.

That all Cathedrals should be open to the public, free of charge, for inspection, &c., at seasonable hours.

V. CAPITULAR PROPERTY AND REVENUE.

1. EXPENSES OF CAPITULAR ESTABLISHMENTS.

INCOMES OF DEANS AND CANONS.

That the annual income of every Deanery in England be not less than 1500*l.*, and the income of every Canon Residentiary not less than 750*l.*; and that a corresponding increase be made to the Deaneries and Canonries in Wales.

1. That inasmuch as by the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113, s. 49, and 4 & 5 Vict. c. 39, s. 6, it is provided, that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners shall receive for every suspended Canonry all the dividends and emoluments thereto belonging, "in like manner as the holder of such Canonry, or his successor, would have been entitled to receive the same:"

In future the Ecclesiastical Commissioners be entitled to receive for each suspended Canonry in any Cathedral (the revenues of which Canonry are now or hereafter may be payable to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners) a payment equal to the average revenue of such Canonry for the last fourteen years.

2. That all the improved revenue derived or to be derived from the Capitular property by enfranchising copyholds, sales of reversions, and purchases of lease-

hold interests, be invested for the benefit of the several Chapters, the interest to be applied hereafter towards the augmentation of Capitular incomes and the improvement of Cathedral institutions; provided always, that no present member of any Chapter shall derive any increase of revenue from this fund.

3. That for every Canonry augmented, or partly augmented, according to the proposed new scale, the payment to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for one suspended Canonry be augmented equally at the same time; and so on, till the payments for all the suspended Canonries are so augmented.

INCOMES OF MINOR CANONS AND OTHER MEMBERS, AND VARIOUS EXPENSES.

1. That the stipends of Minor Canons should increase with the length of service.

That when the office of Precentor is held by a Minor Canon, he receive an addition of 50*l.* to his income, and be constantly resident.

2. That an estimate of the amount required annually, for the purposes hereafter recited, and other necessary expenses, be prepared by each Chapter, and laid before the Cathedral Commissioners for their approval; and a certain fund set apart for each purpose, viz. :—

- A. Incomes of Canons Non-Residentiary, Schoolmasters, Minor Canons, and other Members;
- Expenses of Choir, Schools, &c.;
- Retiring Pensions and Apprentice Fees for Choristers;

according to the recommendations under the several heads of our Report.

- B. Repairs of the fabric of the Cathedral Church, and of the Capitular buildings; the Chapter having the power to borrow money on the Special Fabric Fund for great emergencies.

3. That an annual statement of accounts be prepared by the Chapter, and laid before the Greater Chapter at the Annual Meeting.

4. That any variations which may hereafter be required in the apportionment of revenue to various purposes be laid before the Bishop and the Greater Chapter, and sanctioned by the Archbishop of the province.

2. MANAGEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF PROPERTY, AND AUGMENTATION OF VICARAGES.

That the Permissive Acts of 1851 and 1854 (so far as they relate to Capitular Property), be continued in force for seven years from the end of the present Session of Parliament.

That, except in special cases, the reversions of Capitular tithe rent-charges be not sold, but that they be brought into hand gradually by means of the sums received for the reversion of lands, manors, and houses.

That the Chapters be allowed to mortgage a particular rent-charge, for the purpose of meeting an emergency.

That on the renewal or expiration of a tithe lease, provision be made (if necessary and practicable) for permanently augmenting the Vicarage.

That the Chapters be empowered, with consent of the Estates Commissioners, to assign portions of funded property, as well as lands, in augmentation of Vicarages, or towards building of Parsonage-houses.

That all the surplus revenue obtained from the estates of York, Carlisle, Peterborough, and Chester, and any other Chapters which have made, or may hereafter make, similar transfers, be held in reserve (according to the provisions of the Act of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 35) until the estimate of expenditure for each Cathedral has been sanctioned by the Cathedral Commissioners.

VI. ERECTION OF NEW SEES, AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISCHARGE OF EPISCOPAL DUTIES.

NEW SEES.

1. That a Permissive Bill should be framed and introduced into Parliament (similar to the Act 31 Hen. VIII. c. 9) empowering your Majesty and your Majesty's successors to divide any diocese, under certain conditions of territory and population; and with the consent of the Bishop, where it is proposed to effect the division before the avoidance of the See.

2. That in no case should a new see be erected, unless a sufficient income, with a suitable residence, be provided.

3. That the funds for these purposes might be provided partly by local contributions, or out of episcopal property now in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

4. That powers be given in the enabling Act to allow your Majesty, upon advice of the Cathedral Commission, to authorise from time to time the union of the offices of Bishop and Dean.

Certain places may be mentioned as offering special claims and facilities for the creation of additional Bishoprics.

Among the foremost of these we would enumerate—

St. Columb (for Cornwall).

Westminster.

Gloucester and Bristol (to be again made independent Sees).

Southwell.

That there are other places in which it is desirable that new Sees should be founded.

OTHER ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DISCHARGE OF EPISCOPAL DUTIES.

That a general Statute should be framed, enabling your Majesty, after due inquiry by a Commission specially appointed for that purpose, to recommend a person to be elected Coadjutor, *cum jure successionis*, to a Bishop, in case of such Bishop requiring such aid and relief, by reason of advanced age or protracted infirmity, and being ready to surrender a portion of his Episcopal income in favour of such Coadjutor.



